DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 607 SP 018 846

TITLE	How to Know That You Have Met Federal Teachers Centers Application Criteria: a guidebook providing some indicators of federal criteria.
INSTITUTION	National Teacher Center Resource Center, Providence, R.I.: Rhode Island State Board of Education, Providence.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 81
CONTRACT	300-78-0408
NOTE	19p.: For related documents, see SP 018 841-842 and SP 018 844-848.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation Criteria: Federal Programs: Information Dissemination: Professional Personnel: Program Budgeting: *Program Descriptions: *Program Development: Program Evaluation: *Program Proposals: *Proposal Writing: Self Evaluation (Groups): State Standards: *Teacher Centers: Technical Assistance

ABSTRAC'

Guidelines for proposing a federally funded teacher center were developed by the National Teacher Center Resource Center to assist local education agencies and institutions of higher education to complete teacher center program proposals. This manual is designed to assist proposal writers and those providing technical assistance to know when federal criteria have been met adequately. It is not the intent of the guidebook to suggest a format for teacher center proposals. It is hoped, rather, that the "suggested" indicators will spark ideas for proposal improvement and will help writers and technical assistants to see their proposals more objectively. The program proposal evaluation criteria include: (1) plan of operation: (2) quality of key personnel: (3) budget and cost effectiveness: (4) evaluation plan: (5) adequacy of resources: (6) authority of policy board: (7) potential for increasing teacher effectiveness: (8) adequacy of dissemination: (9) size, scope, and duration: (10) potential impact of inservice training: (11) representatives of policy board: and (12) support of new or expanded activities. (Authors/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206607

HOW TO KNOW THAT YOU HAVE MET FEDERAL TEACHER CENTERS APPLICATION CRITERIA: a guidebook providing some indicators of federal criteria

developed by

the National Teacher Center Resource Center
235 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaretta L. Edwards

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Revised, January 1981

SP 018 946

National Teacher Center Resource Center
Advisory Board

Larry Billips, National Education Association

Edward L. Dambruch, Rhode Island State Department of Education

W. Edwin Ellis, National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education

William Hering, Teachers' Centers Exchange, Far West Laboratory

Diane Jones, Teacher Corps, U.S. Department of Education

Alf Langland, Washington State Department of Education

Drew Lebby, Office of Dissemination and Professional Development, US Department of Education

Ervin C. Marsh, Delaware State Department of Public Instruction

Elearnor McMahon, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Joe Minor, Tennessee State Department of Education

Allen A. Schmieder, Teacher Centers Program, U.S. Department of Education

Pat Weiler, American Federation of Teachers Teacher Center Resource Exchange

Lee Wickline, National Diffusion Network, U.S. Department of Education

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to contract No. 300-78-0408 of the U.S. Department of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

INTRODUCTION

In October 1978, the National Teacher Center Resource Center developed a guideline of indicators of federal Teacher Centers criteria. It was developed to accompany the federal Program's 1978 Regulations, and was distributed to all State Teacher Centers Coordinators to assist them in helping local education agencies and institutions of higher education to complete Teacher Center applications.

The 1978 manual has been updated to correspond to the Teacher Centers criteria published in the Federal Register, December 8, 1980. The current criteria implement the changes in the Teacher Centers Program that were made by the Education Amendments of 1978 and The Education Amendments of 1980. The new criteria are also consistent with EDGAR.

The Resource Center hopes that this document will assist proposal writers and those providing technical assistance in proposal development to know when federal criteria have been met adequately. It is not the intent of this guidebook to suggest a format for Teacher Centers proposals. It is hoped, rather, that the "suggested" indicators will spark ideas for proposal improvement, and will help writers and technical assistants to see their proposals more objectively.

For additional copies, or to provide input for additional guidebook revisions, please contact:

Edward L. Dambruch
or
Margaretta L. Edwards
National Teacher Center Resource Center
235 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908
401/277-6834

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction..... i

Table of Contents..... ii

Criterion a. Plan of operation (10 points)..... 1

Criterion b. Quality of key personnel (7 points)..... 3

Criterion c. Budget and cost effectiveness (5 points)..... 4

Criterion d. Evaluation plan (5 points)..... 5

Criterion e. Adequacy of resources (5 points)..... 6

Criterion f. Authority of policy board (10 points)..... 7

Criterion g. Potential for increasing teacher effectiveness (20 points)... 8

Criterion h. Adequacy of dissemination (3 points)..... 10

Criterion i. Size, scope and duration (5 points)..... 11

Criterion j. Potential impact on inservice training (15 points)..... 12

Criterion k. Representativeness of policy board (10 points)..... 13

Criterion l. Support of new or expanded activities (5 points)..... 14

Criterion: a. Plan of operation (10 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the quality of the plan of operation for the project.

2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--
   i) High quality in the design of the project;
   ii) An effective plan of management that insures proper and efficient administration of the projects;
   iii) A clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the program;
   iv) The way the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve each objective; and
   v) A clear description of how the applicant will provide equal access and treatment for eligible project participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as--
      A) Members of racial or ethnic minority groups;
      B) Women;
      C) Handicapped persons; and
      D) The elderly.

   vi) For grants made after October 1, 1980, a clear description of how the applicant will provide for participation of teachers employed at nonprofit private schools that choose to participate in the teacher center.

Suggested Indicators (a)

Some indicators of a sound plan of operation:

1) Objectives relate clearly to stated needs and are sharply defined, clearly stated, and capable of being attained by the proposed procedures.

2) Objectives are: 1) consistent in format; 2) concise and complete; 3) measurable; 4) supported by sub-objectives or activities.

3) Plan of operation describes the scope and sequence of activities from day one of the project.

4) Plan moves from client need, to general goal, to objectives, to activities, to outcomes, and includes a timeline. The relationship among these stages is clear.

5) Design clearly allows for client input within the framework of ongoing process.

6) Plan defines the roles of the grantee/Board/staff, indicating effective management of resources (both people and dollars.)

Suggested Indicators (a) --continued

7) Plan identifies client groups that have been previously underrepresented and specifies their planned involvement.

8) Plan clearly specifies how teachers from non-profit private schools will be able to participate.

Criterion: b. Quality of key personnel (7 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the quality of the key personnel the applicant plans to use on the project.

2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--
   i) The qualifications of the project director (if one is to be used);
   ii) The qualifications of each of the other key personnel to be used in the project;
   iii) The time that each person referred to in paragraphs b., 2) i), and ii) of this section plans to commit to the project; and
   iv) The extent to which the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as--
      A) Members of racial or ethnic minority groups;
      B) Women;
      C) Handicapped persons; and
      D) The elderly.

3) To determine the qualifications of a person, the Secretary considers evidence of past experience and training, in fields related to the objectives of the project, as well as other information that the applicant provides.

Suggested Indicators (b)

Some indicators of quality of key personnel:

1) Application includes very specific job descriptions of each position which describe qualifications such as: teaching experience; involvement in leadership positions in professional teaching organizations; previous staff development experience; previous training required; etc.

2) An affirmative action statement is included and explained.

3) Specific roles are identified for consultants as well as a description of how consultants will be selected and used.

Criterion: c. Budget and cost effectiveness (5 points)

1) The Secretary looks for information that shows--
   i) The budget for the project is adequate to support the project activities; and
   ii) Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives of the project.

Suggested Indicators (c)

Some indicators of budget and cost effectiveness:

1) A functional budget is provided, assigning resources by objective.

2) A line item budget is provided including a rationale for items.

3) "Reasonableness" is documented by inclusion of existing consultant rates, mileage rate, cost of course credit, etc.

4) Procedures used in developing budget estimates are described.

5) Cost information for comparable activities is included (e.g., costs to train, costs to generate searches, etc.).

6) Cost information regarding substitute teachers is provided with comparable data.

7) Information regarding the proportion of cost allocated released time or substitutes is compared to total program cost.

8) Rationale for using or not using released time or substitutes is provided.

Criterion: d. Evaluation plan (5 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the quality of the evaluation plan for the project.

2) The Secretary looks for information that shows methods of evaluation that are appropriate for the project and to the extent possible, are objective and produce data that are quantifiable.

Suggested Indicators (d)

Some indicators of an evaluation plan:

1) A clearly defined evaluation model describing program design (what the project intends to accomplish) and evaluation design (what will be measured) is provided. Model should provide for both formative (on-going) and summative (final) evaluation.

2) Feedback mechanisms and strategies to use evaluation information to change existing procedures and plans are provided. (For example, part of the monthly board meeting will deal with evaluation feedback.)

3) A plan exists for determining the extent to which the objectives will be accomplished.

Criterion: e. Adequacy of resources (5 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows that the applicant plans to devote adequate resources to the project.

2) The Secretary looks for information that shows--
   i) The facilities that the applicant plans to use are adequate; and
   ii) The equipment and supplies that the applicant plans to use are adequate.

Suggested Indicators (e)

Some indicators that reveal that resources will be adequate:

1) Proposal clearly relates resources to objectives and activities described.

2) Proposal clearly describes the site of the project, or clearly describes that there is to be no one site or facility. In the latter case, the proposal describes the "process" of the Teacher Center operation.

3) Proposal emphasizes how dollars will be used to aid people, not to purchase things or hardware.

4) The use of the professional organization(s) and their network of available resources is documented. (A plan of how this network resource will be mobilized is included.)

5) A plan to identify and secure ongoing resources to meet new needs is provided.

Criterion: f. Authority of Policy Board (10 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the extent of the teacher center policy board's authority and responsibility for supervision of the project.

Suggested Indicators (f)

Some indicators that describe the authority of the Policy Board:

1) Bylaws are established (and provided) which delineate the role, responsibility and authority of the policy board. Examples showing authority might include:
   A) identifying eligible project participants
   B) hiring/employment of staff consultants and/or experts
   C) budgeting/expenditure of funds
   D) subcontracting for technical or other assistance
   E) statement regarding authority of board to set bylaws.

2) A memo of agreement between grantee and board regarding authority of each one is included. (Memo might include documentation of legal and non-legal constraints upon the board.)

3) Minutes documenting planning meetings are provided.

4) Relationship of board to staff is described.

5) A "sign off sheet" providing the names and affiliations of all board members is provided.

6) A statement that the board is/will be involved in the development and approval of proposals before submission, and plans before implementation, is included.

Criterion: g. Potential for increasing teacher effectiveness (20 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the potential of the proposed teacher center for increasing the effectiveness of the teachers served, in terms of the learning needs of their students.

Suggested Indicators (g)

Some indicators of the potential for increasing teacher effectiveness:

1) A convincing statement of the educational needs of the students is provided.

2) A convincing statement of the teachers' needs for inservice education and/or curriculum development in relation to the students' needs is provided.

3) The two (above) needs assessments are tied together so that "it seems reasonable to believe" that meeting the teachers' needs (no. 2) will contribute to meeting the students' needs (no. 1). Eventual evaluation may include examination of new or previously used data bases.)

4) Proposal explains clearly how teachers will make policy decisions.

5) A study of the laws and policies affecting educational needs (e.g., bilingual laws) at the federal, state and local levels will be undertaken.

6) Description of anticipated increased educational opportunities for students as a result of teacher participation in teacher center activities is included.

7) Sources and collection procedures for student and teacher needs identified, and a distinction is made between perceived and assessed needs.

8) A description of how the teacher center programs will identify and respond to emerging as well as identified, ongoing needs is provided.

9) Program description might include activities in the following areas:

   A) development and production of curricula
   B) facilitating teacher accessibility to educational research
   C) providing training to better meet special student needs and

Suggested Indicators (g)--continued

familiarize teachers with current educational research to improve teaching skills.

Editor's note: Be sure to cite specific data to establish needs; do not promise a remedy (i.e., that test scores will be raised by the proposed activities).

Criterion: h. Adequacy of dissemination (3 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the adequacy of provisions for dissemination of the results of the project.

Suggested Indicators (h)

Some indicators of the adequacy of dissemination:

1) A dissemination plan is provided that includes what will be disseminated (content), to whom (target audience), how (methods of dissemination), and when (timeline).

2) The use of the existing network system of the professional organizations (local AFT, NEA) is described. (The use of the local administrators' organization network as well as the school committee's network might also be described.)

3) The proposal demonstrates how information about the center will reach the general community or those who do not use the center.

4) The proposal demonstrates how the effectiveness of dissemination strategies will be monitored.

5) A description is provided of how dissemination of information to appropriate decision makers will/can lead them toward the eventual institutionalization of staff development activities (or towards the establishment of a climate for institutionalizing).

Criterion: i. Size, scope and duration (5 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the appropriateness of size, scope and duration of the project so as to secure productive results.

Suggested Indicators (i)

Some indicators of appropriate project size, scope and duration:

1) Description of and appropriateness of size, scope and duration must be realistic and reasonable to the reader. For example, a clear description of the population to be served could include:
   A) area served (school district, multiple districts, etc.)
   B) eligible participants (public and private school classroom teachers, etc.)

2) Timelines provided are valid and reasonable.

3) Commitment of constituencies to project is documented.

Editor's note: A danger lies in trying to serve everyone. Realistic and reasonable plans identify "some" to be served rather than "all."

Criterion: j. Potential impact on inservice training (15 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the potential of the teacher center to impact upon and improve the grantee's overall program of inservice training for teachers.

Suggested Indicators (j)

Indicators of the potential impact of the center upon inservice training:

1) An analysis of present inservice programs is included.

2) Problems in the present program of inservice training are documented.

3) A specific description of the potential of the teacher center to serve and expand upon existing programs is provided.

4) Participation of those responsible for other inservice programs is evident at the policy board level.

5) Proposed activities supplement or follow-up earlier activities from another inservice program.

6) Evidence of cooperation to provide a better service rather than evidence of competition for the same audience is provided.

7) A description of specific procedures and activities to constitute intervention in identified problem areas is provided.

8) Highlights of the service role and brokerage ability of the center to assist categorical programs with their staff development needs are provided. (e.g., How special education, Title I, nutrition education staff development activities can be conducted by the center.)

Editor's note: See indicators for "1" as well.

Criterion: k. Representativeness of policy board (10 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the representativeness of the teacher center policy board under 240.13.

Suggested Indicators (k)

Some indicators of the representativeness of the policy board:

1) A list of policy board members and their affiliations is provided.

2) Evidence that the teacher majority of the policy board fairly reflects the makeup of all teachers in the area to be served is provided.

3) The selection process for teachers, school board members, institutions of higher education and non-public school representatives is described.

4) The process by which information will flow quickly to and from policy board members and their constituents or organizations is outlined.

Criterion: 1. Support of new or expanded activities (5 points)

1) The Secretary reviews each application for information that shows the extent to which Federal funds will support new or expanded activities rather than supporting activities which are already being paid for from other resources.

Suggested Indicators (1)

Indicators that the program will support new or expanded activities:

1) See indicators under (j).

2) Using the facts of what exists in inservice (description of present programs, funding levels and sources of funds), the proposal goes on to describe what needs are not being met, and how the center will meet new needs while complimenting existing procedures and programs.

3) A clear description of the kinds of activities that will be initiated with federal funds is provided. (e.g., expansion of existing programs or implementation of new programs.)